

**Claims:**

The applicant has requested **Constructive Assistance**. Therefore another request for **Constructive Assistance is made**. The applicants have amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 107.03(d) and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

1. Response to Question 2 on page 2 of the Office Action dated 07/02/2003:

The application was filed as a divisional with reference to page 2 of the specification top of the page:

**"CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS**

This is a division of application Ser. Nr. 09/556,395, Filed 04/24/2000, now patent Nr. 6537823 granted 03/25/2003."

2. Response to Questions 3-4 on Page 2 of the Office Action dated 07/02/2003:

The applicant only submitted 2 (two) claims with this divisional application filed on 03/21/03. The parent application had 5 claims originally submitted. Not sure how to respond to rejection of claims not submitted, please advise.

3. Response to Question 6 on page 3 of Office Action dated 07/02/2003:

It is true that exposure to bromine can be assessed by regular monitoring of SeBr. However, this invention is directed to an individual placing bromine (in an oxidative state) into a sample (urine, etc.) in an effort to tamper with (adulterate) a specimen that is being submitted for drugs-of-abuse testing. SeBr is not considered an oxidatively active compound that could be used to adulterate a specimen for drug testing in an effort to

cause false negative results. Therefore, the assessing of SeBr for health reasons and the measurement of an oxidant such as Bromine for adulteration are radically different and are in different field of natural science and Bromine measurement for adulteration cannot be assessed by measuring SeBr activity or presence.

With regards to Douglas, this is method for hydrophobic barriers/zones between assays dipstick assays and makes no similar reference or methods that is presented by the present art. The present makes no claim to the use of Evans blue, iodide salt, starch and dextran in it claims. For a good reason. This would never work in a urine or other biological fluid matrix. It is supposed that the Douglas assay is for pools because there is no way it could compensate for the buffer of affect of urine or other matrices.

4. Response to Questions 7-8 on page 3 of Office Action dated 07/02/2003:

The applicant only filed for 1-2 claims and assumes that the Examiner is talking about claims 1-5 of the parent application with regards to double patenting. The applicant would appreciate any advise the Examiner could give with regards to this question.